arXiv:1207.6454v1 [math.RT] 27 Jul 2012

TRANSFER OF K-TYPES ON LOCAL THETA LIFTS OF CHARACTERS AND UNITARY LOWEST WEIGHT MODULES

HUNG YEAN LOKE, JIA-JUN MA, AND U-LIANG TANG

Abstract. In this paper we study representations of the indefinite orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$ which are obtained from local theta lifts of one dimensional characters or unitary lowest weight modules of the double covers of the symplectic groups. We apply the principle of transfer of K-types on these representations of $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$, and we study their effects on the dual pair correspondences. Finally we will use these results to study subquotients of some cohomologically induced modules.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study representations of the indefinite orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$ which are obtained from local theta lifts of one dimensional characters or unitary lowest weight modules of the double covers of the symplectic groups. First we apply the principle of transfer of K-types on these representations of $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$, and we study their effects on the dual pair correspondences. Finally we will use these results to study subquotients of some cohomologically induced modules.

We introduce the Harish-Chandra module $\theta_p^{n,m}$ of $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$. Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p(n+m),\mathbb{R})$ be the metaplectic double cover of $\mathrm{Sp}(p(n+m),\mathbb{R})$. It contains a dual pair $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})' \cdot \tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$. Here $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})'$ and $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$ are (possibly split) two covers of $\mathrm{Sp}(p,\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$ respectively. A representation of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$) is called a genuine representation if it does not factor through the linear group $\mathrm{Sp}(p,\mathbb{R})$ (resp. $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$).

We will always assume that $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})'$ splits over $\mathrm{Sp}(p,\mathbb{R})$. This happens if and only if $m+n$ is even. Let ς' denote the genuine one dimensional character of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})'$. We fix an oscillator representation of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p(n+m),\mathbb{R})$ and we let $\tilde{\theta}_p^{n,m}$ denote the local theta lift of ς' to $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$ with respect to this oscillator representation [H2]. The module $\tilde{\theta}_p^{n,m}$ is an irreducible Harish-Chandra module of $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$. The group $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$ splits over $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$ if and only if p is even. Since $m+n$ is even, $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$ has 8 connected components and it has four genuine one dimensional characters. We will explain a choice of a genuine character ς in the paragraph before (6). We set $\theta_p^{n,m} := \varsigma\tilde{\theta}_p^{n,m}$ which is an irreducible Harish-Chandra module of $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$. We will call $\theta_p^{n,m}$ the theta lift of the trivial character of $\mathrm{Sp}(p,\mathbb{R})$.

We say that the dual pair $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})' \times \tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$ is in the *stable range* if $2p \leq \min(n,m)$ and $2p < \max(n,m)$. Our definition excludes the case $m = n = 2p$. For simplicity, we

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E46, 22E47.

Key words and phrases. local theta lifts, Zuckerman functors, transfer of K-types.

will say that (p,n,m) is in stable range. By [Li], the Harish-Chandra module $\theta_p^{n,m}$ is nonzero and unitarizable in the stable range.

Let $K_{n,m} = \mathrm{O}(n) \times \mathrm{O}(m)$ denote a maximal compact subgroup of $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$. The $K_{n,m}$-types of $\theta_p^{n,m}$ are described in (6). It is $K_{n,m}$-multiplicity free and it is both $\mathrm{O}(n) \times 1$-admissible and $1 \times \mathrm{O}(m)$-admissible. Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,r,m-r}\theta_p^{n,m}$ denote the restriction of $\theta_p^{n,m}$ as a $(\mathfrak{so}(n+m,\mathbb{C}), \mathrm{O}(n)\times\mathrm{O}(r)\times\mathrm{O}(m-r))$-module. We will apply the principle of transfer of K-types to due to Enright and Wallach [Wa2]. More precisely we apply the pr-th derived functor $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$ of the Zuckerman functor to $\mathcal{F}_{n,r,m-r}\theta_p^{n,m}$. Since $\mathrm{O}(n+r)$ is not connected, special care is necessary. See Section 2.2 for a discussion. Let ρ_N denote the half sum of positive roots of $\mathfrak{so}(N)$ and let $\mathbf{1}_p = (1,\ldots,1) \in \mathbb{Z}^p$. We can now state the first main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $n+m$ is even and (p,n,m) is in the stable range. Let $0 < r < m$.*

(i) If $2p > m-r$, then $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\mathcal{F}_{n,r,m-r}\theta_p^{n,m}) = 0$.

(ii) If $2p \le m-r$, then

$$\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\mathcal{F}_{n,r,m-r}(\theta_p^{n,m})) = \theta_p^{n+r,m-r}$$

as $(\mathfrak{so}(n+m,\mathbb{C}), K_{n,m})$-modules.

(iii) We set $N = n+m$. Then every representation in the collection

$$\{\theta_p^{a,b} : a+b = N, a \ge 2p, b \ge 2p\}$$

has the same annihilator ideal in the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{so}(n+m,\mathbb{C})$. The annihilator ideal is the maximal primitive ideal with infinitesimal character $\rho_N - p\mathbf{1}_{N/2}$.

(iv) Let $a+b = n+m$. Suppose $\theta_p^{n,m} \to \pi_a \boxtimes \pi_b$ is a nontrivial quotient where π_a and π_b are irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{so}(a,\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{so}(b,\mathbb{C})$ respectively. Then the infinitesimal characters of π_a and π_b must respect the following correspondence:

$$(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p,\rho_{a-2p}) \longleftrightarrow (\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p,\rho_{b-2p}) \qquad \text{if } b \ge a \ge 2p, \tag{1}$$

$$(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_s) \longleftrightarrow (\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_s,\rho_{b-a} - \frac{2p-a}{2}\mathbf{1}_{\frac{b-a}{2}}) \qquad \text{if } a < 2p \tag{2}$$

where $s = [\frac{a}{2}]$. See Section 2.1 for the notations on weights.

The module $\tilde{\theta}_p^{n,m}$ has been investigated in a number of papers [HZ], [KØ], [LZ], [Z].

Irreducible representations of $\mathrm{O}(r')$ are parameterized by certain arrays of nonnegative integers $\mu = (\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_{r'}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r'}$. See Section 2.1. Let $\tau = \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}$ be an irreducible finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{O}(r')$ corresponding to μ. Then the local theta lift $L(\tau)$ of τ to a double cover $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(p,\mathbb{R})''$ is a unitarizable lowest weight module. A result of [EHW] states that conversely, a unitarizable lowest weight module of the connected component of a double cover of $\mathrm{Sp}(p,\mathbb{R})$ is the restriction of a unique $L(\tau)$. Let $\tilde{\theta}_p^{n,r}(\tau)$ denote its local theta lift to $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,r)$. We suppose that it is nonzero. We will choose a genuine character ς'' of $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,r)$, such that $\theta_p^{n,r}(\tau) := \varsigma''\tilde{\theta}_p^{n,r}(\tau)$ has a K-type decomposition as in (8). We remark that $\theta_p^{n,r}(\tau)$ is almost never K-multiplicity free. We also denote $\theta_p^{n,r}(\tau)$ by $\theta_p^{n,r}(\mu)$. We will state our second main theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose $(p,n,r+r')$ is in the stable range. Let τ and $\theta_p^{n,r}(\tau)$ as above. Let $0<t<r$.*

(i) If $2p>r+r'-t$, then $\Gamma^{pt}_{\mathrm{O}(n+t)}(\mathcal{F}_{n,t,r-t}\theta_p^{n,r}(\tau))=0$.

(ii) If $2p\leq r+r'-t$, then

$$\Gamma^{pt}_{\mathrm{O}(n+t)}(\mathcal{F}_{n,t,r-t}\theta_p^{n,r}(\tau))=\theta_p^{n+t,r-t}(\tau)$$

as $(\mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C}),K_{n+r,r-t})$-modules.

In (ii), it is possible that $\theta_p^{n+t,r-t}(\tau)=0$ and when this happens, the above theorem says that the left hand side of (ii) is also zero.

We will prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in Section 3.

In Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we have assume that (p,n,m) and $(p,n,r+r')$ lie in the stable range. In Section 3.5, we will address the situation when we are outside of this range.

1.3. Cohomological inductions. We will apply the above two theorems to some cohomological induced modules. In order to state our next main result, we recall some basic definitions and notation from [KV] and [Wa1].

We suppose $2p\leq n\leq m$, $2p<m$ and $m=r+r'$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_0=\mathfrak{so}(n,r)$ and $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C})$. Let $\mathfrak{t}_0$ be a compact Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(n)\oplus\mathfrak{so}(r)$ in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. Let $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C})$. Let $\lambda'_0=(p,p-1,\ldots,1,0,0,\ldots,0)\in\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_0^*$. Let $\mathfrak{q}'=\mathfrak{l}'+\mathfrak{n}'$ be the maximal θ-stable parabolic subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}_1\otimes\mathbb{C}$ defined by λ'_0. We have $\mathfrak{l}'_0=\mathfrak{u}(1)^p\oplus\mathfrak{so}(n-2p,m)$. Let $L'=\mathrm{U}(1)^p\times\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)$ be the subgroups in $\mathrm{O}(n,r)$ whose Lie algebras is $\mathfrak{l}'_0$. Let $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$ be a character of $\mathrm{U}(1)^p$. We extend it to a character of L' such that $\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)$ acts on it by $\det^p_{\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)}$. Let $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{k}_{n,r}\oplus\mathfrak{p}_{n,r}$ denote the Cartan decomposition. We refer to [KV] for the definition of $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)=\mathcal{L}_{s_0}(\mathbb{C}_\lambda)$ where $s_0=\dim(\mathfrak{k}_{n,r}\cap\mathfrak{n}')$. It is an $(\mathfrak{g},K^0_{n,r})$-module with infinitesimal character $\lambda+\rho_{n+r}$. The image of the bottom layer map is a $K^0_{n,r}$-type of $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ with highest weight $\mu(\mathfrak{q}',\lambda)=\lambda+2\rho(\mathfrak{n}'\cap\mathfrak{p}_{n,r})$.

In Section 4, we will define an $(\mathfrak{g},K_{n,r})$-module $A(\lambda)$. This module has the property that as an $(\mathfrak{g},K^0_{n,r})$-module, $A(\lambda)=A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ if $n>2p$ and $A(\lambda)=A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)\oplus A_{\mathfrak{q}''}(\lambda')$. Here $A_{\mathfrak{q}''}(\lambda')$ is the conjugate of $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ by an element in $\mathrm{O}(n)\setminus\mathrm{SO}(n)$. By Lemma 4.1, the image of the bottom layer map is the minimal $K_{n,r}$-type $\tau_{\min}$ of $A(\lambda)$. Let $\overline{A}(\lambda)$ denote the irreducible subquotient of $A(\lambda)$ generated by $\tau_{\min}$. We can now state our main result on cohomological inductions.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose $2p\leq n\leq m$, $2p<m$ and $0\leq r<m$.*

(i) The irreducible $(\mathfrak{so}(n,m),K_{n,m})$-modules $\theta_p^{n,m}$ and $\overline{A}(\lambda)$ are isomorphic where $\lambda=-\frac{m+n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p$.

(ii) The irreducible $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r),K_{n,r})$-modules $\theta_p^{n,r}(\mu)$ and $\overline{A}(\lambda)$ are isomorphic where $\lambda=(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_p)+\frac{m-n-2r}{2}\mathbf{1}_p$.

We remark that in (ii), $\theta_p^{n,r}(\mu) = 0$ if $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2 \ldots)$ and $\mu_{p+1} > 0$.

We also remind that $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ in the above theorem is not always in the good or weakly good range (see Definition 0.49 in [KV]). It is interesting to find unitarizable subquotients generated by the images of the bottom layer maps.

We will explain the motivation of the above theorem. First we consider the special case when $n = 2p < r$, $\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = \frac{m-n-2r}{2}$. In [Kn], Knapp constructs a unitarizable quotient A' of $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ by extending the method of Gross and Wallach [GW]. The quotient module A' contains the image of the bottom layer map. He asked if A' is irreducible and if A' is related to local theta lifts. The first question was answered by Trapa where he showed that A' is irreducible [T]. Hence $A' = \overline{A}(\lambda)$. He also computed its associated cycles. In [PT], Trapa and Paul show that A' is a submodule of $\theta_p^{2p,r}(0)$. Theorem 1.4 could be considered a generalization of these results.

Most of our methods and results extend to the dual pairs $\mathrm{U}(p,q) \times \mathrm{U}(n,m)$ and $\mathrm{O}^*(2p) \times \widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(n,m)$. The first step is to extend the results of [Lo] to these two dual pairs. For $\mathrm{U}(p,q) \times \mathrm{U}(n,m)$, this is part of a forthcoming paper of one of the authors [Ta].

Acknowledgment. The first author is supported by an NUS grant R-146-000-131-112.

2. The Zuckerman functors

The main objective of this section is to set up some notations and define the Zuckerman functor in Theorem 1.1.

2.1. Notations. Let $\mathbf{1}_n := (1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{0}_n := (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then we denote $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ by (λ, ξ).

Let $r = [\frac{n}{2}]$ and let $\rho_n \in \mathbb{R}^r$ denote the half sum of positive roots of $\mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{C})$. Let τ_n^μ denote the irreducible finite dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ with highest weight $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^r$. The set of highest weights of $\mathrm{SO}(n)$ is denoted by $\Lambda(n, 0)$ while the set of highest weights of genuine representations of $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$ is denoted by $\Lambda(n, \frac{1}{2})$.

We will denote the trivial and the determinant representation of $\mathrm{O}(n)$ by $\mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(n)}$ and d_n respectively. Irreducible representations of $\mathrm{O}(n)$ are parameterized by arrays of the form

$$\mu = (a_1, \ldots, a_k, \mathbf{0}_{n-k}) \text{ or } (a_1, \ldots, a_k, \mathbf{1}_{n-2k}, \mathbf{0}_k) \tag{3}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^n$ where a_i are positive integers, $a_i \geq a_{i+1}$ and $k \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$. See [GoW]. We will call these arrays *weights* of $\mathrm{O}(n)$. Let $\Lambda(\mathrm{O}(n))$ denote the set of such weights. Let $\tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^\mu$ denote the irreducible finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{O}(n)$ with highest weight μ. The two representations corresponding to the two highest weights in (3) differ by the character d_n. In general, we would ignore the string of zeros at the end of a weight $(a_1, \ldots, a_k, \mathbf{0}_{n-k})$ and write it as $(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ instead.

Finally we recall a branching rule: The dimension of $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{O}(n)}(\tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^\mu, \tau_{\mathrm{O}(n+1)}^{\mu'})$ is at most one and it is one if and only if $\mu_i' \geq \mu_i \geq \mu_{i+1}'$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

2.2. Zuckerman functors. Let $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C})$ and $K_{n,r} = \mathrm{O}(n) \times \mathrm{O}(r)$. Let W be an admissible $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r})$-module. We will follow [Wa1] and define the i-th derived Zuckerman functor by

$$\Gamma^i(W) = \Gamma^i_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(W) := \sum_F \mathrm{H}^i(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r}; W \otimes F^*) \otimes F \tag{4}$$

where the sum is taken over all irreducible finite dimensional representations F of $\mathrm{O}(n+r)$. Hence $\Gamma^i(W)$ is nonzero if and only if the Lie algebra cohomology

$$\mathrm{H}^i(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r}; W \otimes F^*)$$

is nonzero for some F. Suppose the above Lie algebra cohomology is nonzero, then by Wigner's lemma, W and F have the same infinitesimal character. In particular W has regular infinitesimal character. Furthermore, since $K_{n,r}$ contains the center of $\mathrm{O}(n+r)$, W and F have the same central character. Let $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{k}_{n,r} \oplus \mathfrak{p}_{n,r}$ be the complexified Cartan decomposition. By Proposition 9.4.3 in [Wa1], if W is unitarizable, then

$$\mathrm{H}^i(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r}; W \otimes F^*) = \mathrm{Hom}_{K_{n,r}}(\wedge^i \mathfrak{p}_{n,r}, W \otimes F^*) = \mathrm{Hom}_{K_{n,r}}(F \otimes \wedge^i \mathfrak{p}_{n,r}, W). \tag{5}$$

We remark that [Wa1] requires that the maximal compact subgroup is connected. However the proof there works for $K = K_{n,r}$ too without any modification.

3. Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

First we recall some facts about $\tilde{\theta}^{n,m}_p$ in [Lo]. We will assume that $n+m$ is even and (p,n,m) is in the stable range. There are four choices of the genuine character ς of $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,m)$ as mentioned in the introduction. We will fix a choice of ς so that $\theta^{n,m}_p = \varsigma\tilde{\theta}^{n,m}_p$ has $K_{n,m}$-types

$$\theta^{n,m}_p = \sum_{l=(l_1,\ldots,l_p)} \mathrm{d}^p_n \tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{(l+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p,\mathbf{0}_{n-p})} \boxtimes \tau_{\mathrm{O}(m)}^{(l,\mathbf{0}_{m-p})} \tag{6}$$

where is sum is taken over $l = (l_1, \ldots, l_p)$ such that l_i are non-negative integers and $l_1 \geq l_2 \geq \ldots \geq l_p \geq \min(\frac{n-m}{2}, 0)$. The module $\theta^{n,m}_p$ is unitarizable. The minimal $K_{n,m}$-type $\tau_{\min}$ is $\mathrm{d}^p_n \tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{(\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p,\mathbf{0}_{n-p})} \boxtimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(m)}$ if $m \geq n$ and $\mathrm{d}^p_n \boxtimes \tau_{\mathrm{O}(m)}^{(\frac{n-m}{2}\mathbf{1}_p,\mathbf{0}_{m-p})}$ if $m < n$. If $\min(n,m) = 2p$ then $\theta^{n,m}_p = \theta^{n,m,+}_p \oplus \theta^{n,m,-}_p$ splits into a direct sum of two irreducible $(\mathfrak{so}(n,m), K^0_{n,m})$-modules. Otherwise it is an irreducible $(\mathfrak{so}(n,m), K^0_{n,m})$-module.

Let $m = r + r'$. Since $\theta^{n,m}_p$ is $\mathrm{O}(n) \times 1$-admissible, the restriction of $\theta^{n,m}_p$ as a Harish-Chandra module of $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), K_{n,r}) \times \mathrm{O}(r')$ decomposes discretely as a direct sum

$$\theta^{n,m}_p = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(\mathrm{O}(r'))} \theta^{n,r}_p(\mu) \boxtimes \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}. \tag{7}$$

It follows that $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ is unitarizable and it has $K_{n,r}$-types

$$\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu) = \sum_{l=(l_1,\ldots,l_p)} \left(\mathrm{d}^p_n \tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{(l+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p,\mathbf{0}_{n-p})} \boxtimes \sum_{\kappa} m(l,\mu,\kappa) \tau^{\kappa}_{\mathrm{O}(r)} \right) \tag{8}$$

where the sum is as in (6) and $m(l,\mu,\kappa)$ is the multiplicity of $\tau^{\kappa}_{\mathrm{O}(r)} \boxtimes \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}$ in $\tau^{(l,\mathbf{0}_{m-p})}_{\mathrm{O}(m)}$.

Suppose $k \leq p$. We lift $\tau^{(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_k,\mathbf{0}_{n-k})}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}$ to a unitarizable lowest weight module $L(\mu)$ of a double cover of $\mathrm{Sp}(p,\mathbb{R})$. The lowest $\tilde{\mathrm{U}}(n)$-type has highest weight [KaV]

$$(\mu_1 \ldots, \mu_k, \mathbf{0}_{p-k}) + \frac{n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p.$$

Let $\tilde{\theta}^{n,r}_p(\tau)$ be the theta lift $L(\mu)$ to $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,r)$. In [Lo] we proved that $\tilde{\theta}^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ is an irreducible and unitarizable Harish-Chandra module. In addition there exists a genuine character ς'' of $\tilde{\mathrm{O}}(n,r)$ such that $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu) = \varsigma''\tilde{\theta}^{n,r}_p(\tau)$.

For now on, we will denote $\theta = \theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\theta(\mu) = \theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose (p,n,m) is in stable range and $m = r + r'$.*

(i) If $r' \geq 2p$, then (7) establishes a correspondence of infinitesimal characters between $\mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{so}(r',\mathbb{C})$ which is given by

$$(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p,\rho_{n+r-2p}) \longleftrightarrow (\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p,\rho_{r'-2p}).$$

(ii) If $r' < 2p$, then $\theta(\mu)$ in (7) has singular infinitesimal character.

Proof. This follows from the correspondences of infinitesimal characters $\mathfrak{so}(r',\mathbb{C}) \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{sp}(p,\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{sp}(p,\mathbb{C}) \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C})$ established by the oscillator representations [H1] [Pz]. We will leave the details to the reader. ☐

By symmetry we will assume that $m \geq n$. The correspondence of infinitesimal characters is independent of the real form of $\mathfrak{so}(n,r) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(r')$. Hence if we set $a = r'$ and $b = n + r$, then Lemma 3.1(i) above gives (1) in Theorem 1.1(iv).

We apply $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$ to (7) and we get

$$\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\mathcal{F}_{n,r,r'}\theta) = \sum_{\mu\in\Lambda(\mathrm{O}(r'))} \Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\theta(\mu)) \boxtimes \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}. \tag{9}$$

The equality in the above equation holds by the naturality the Zuckerman functor in Chapter 6 in [Wa1].

By Lemma 3.1(ii), if $r' < 2p$ then $\theta(\mu)$ has singular infinitesimal characters and $\Gamma_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\theta(\mu)) = 0$. This proves Theorem 1.1(i).

Suppose $r' \geq 2p$. Let $n_1 := \frac{n-m+2r}{2}$. By Lemma 3.1(i), $\theta(\mu)$ has infinitesimal character $(\mu - n_1\mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{0}) + \rho_{n+r}$. This is regular if and only if $\mu_p \geq n_1$.

From now on, we will assume that $n, r' \geq 2p$ and $\mu_p \geq n_1$. Let $\mathfrak{t}$ be a Cartan subalgebra of complexified Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}_{n,r}$ of $K_{n,r}$. We set

$$\xi = \xi(\mu) := (\mu - n_1\mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{0}_{n+r-p}) \tag{10}$$

and $\bar{\xi} = \bar{\xi}(\mu) := (\mu - n_1\mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathfrak{t}^*$. Then both $\theta(\mu)$ and $\tau^{\xi(\mu)}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$ have regular infinitesimal character $\bar{\xi}(\mu) + \rho_{n+r}$.

We refer to the $K_{n,r}$-types of $\theta(\mu)$ in (8). By the branching rule described in Section 2.1, we see that the minimal $K_{n,r}$-type of $\theta(\mu)$ is

$$\tau_{\min}(\mu) := \mathrm{d}^p_n \tau^{(\mu+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p,\mathbf{0}_{n-p})}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} \boxtimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(r)}. \tag{11}$$

Lemma 3.3 below computes $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\theta(\mu))$. For connected groups, this is a special case of Section 5 in [VZ] or Theorem 9.5.3 in [Wa1]. It is not too easy to extract the relevant statements there so we will give a proof.

First we prove a special case of Theorem 1.4. Section 1.3.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\lambda = \bar{\xi}(\mu)$ *as in* (10). *Suppose* $\theta(\mu)$ *has regular infinitesimal character* $\bar{\xi}(\mu) + \rho_{n+r}$.

(i) *If* $n = 2p$, *then* $\theta(\mu) = A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda) \oplus A_{\mathfrak{q}''}(\lambda')$. *Here* $A_{\mathfrak{q}''}(\lambda')$ *is the conjugate of* $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ *by an element in* $\mathrm{O}(n) \setminus \mathrm{SO}(n)$.

(ii) *If* $n > 2p$ *then* $\theta(\mu) = A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ *as* $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K^0_{n,r})$*-modules.*

Proof. Since $\theta(\mu)$ has regular infinitesimal character, $\mu_p + \frac{m-n}{2} \geq n_1 + \frac{m-n}{2} = r > 0$. It is well known that $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ with this parameter is an irreducible and unitarizable $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K^0_{n,r})$-module.

The restriction of the unitarizable $\theta(\mu)$ as an $\mathfrak{so}(n,r)$-module decomposes into a direct sum of several irreducible unitary representations. We claim that $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ is an irreducible summand of $\theta(\mu)$. Indeed both modules are unitarizable and has infinitesimal character $\lambda + \rho_{n+r}$. Furthermore by (11) both contain the $K^0_{n,r}$-type $\mu(\mathfrak{q}, \lambda) = \lambda + 2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p}) = (\mu + \frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{0}_{n-p})$. Now the claim follows from Proposition 6.1 in [VZ].

From the consideration of the $K_{n,r}$-types, the other irreducible summands of $\theta(\mu)$ can be obtained by conjugating the submodule $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ with a element in $K_{n,r}$. Therefore the number of irreducible summands of $\theta(\mu)$ as an $\mathfrak{so}(n,r)$-module is equal to number of irreducible summands of $\tau_{\min}(\mu)$ as $K^0_{n,r}$-module. This proves the proposition. ☐

Lemma 3.3. *If* $\theta(\mu)$ *has regular infinitesimal character* $\bar{\xi}(\mu) + \rho_{n+r}$, *then* $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\theta(\mu)) = \mathrm{d}^p_{n+r}\tau^{\xi(\mu)}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_{n,r}$. We set $i = pr$ and $W = \theta(\mu)$ in (4) and (5) and we consider

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{K_{n,r}}(F \otimes \wedge^{pr}\mathfrak{p}, \theta(\mu)). \tag{12}$$

It suffices to show that (12) is one dimensional if $F = \mathrm{d}^p_{n+r}\tau^{\xi(\mu)}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$, and zero if otherwise.

Suppose (12) is nonzero. Then F is an irreducible finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{O}(n+r)$ with infinitesimal character $\bar{\xi}(\mu)+\rho_{n+r}$, ie. F is either $\tau^{\xi(\mu)}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$ or $\mathrm{d}_{n+r}\tau^{\xi(\mu)}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$.

Let ϕ be a nonzero homomorphism of (12). We recall $\tau_{\min}(\mu)$ in (11). By Proposition 3.2 and, Sections 3 and 5 in [VZ],

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{K_{n,r}}(F \otimes \wedge^{pr}\mathfrak{p}, \theta(\mu)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{K_{n,r}}(F \otimes \wedge^{pr}\mathfrak{p}, \tau_{\min}(\mu)). \tag{13}$$

as a subspace of $\mathrm{Hom}_{K^0_{n,r}}(F \otimes \wedge^{pr}\mathfrak{p}, \theta^{n,r}(\mu))$. Moreover ϕ should map $v_F \otimes v_0$ to a highest weight vector of $\tau_{\min}(\mu)$, where v_F is a highest weight vector in F and v_0 is a weight vector of weight $2\rho(\mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{p})$ in $\wedge^{pr}\mathfrak{p}$. Since $\dim \mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{p} = pr$, v_0 is unique up to scalars and is a highest weight vector. We claim ϕ is unique up a scalar. This is clear if $\theta(\mu)$ has irreducible restriction to $\mathfrak{so}(n,r)$. It is also true for the reducible case, since all the relevant highest weights (up to scalars) are in the same $\mathrm{O}(n)$-orbit. Hence right hand side of (13) is at most dimension one.

Note that $\mathrm{O}(r)$ acts trivially on the minimal $K_{n,r}$-type and by $\det^p_{\mathrm{O}(r)}$ on the v_0. Hence it acts on v_F by $\det^p_{\mathrm{O}(r)}$ too. This implies that $F = \mathrm{d}^p_{n+r}\tau^\xi_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$ as required.

Finally it is easy to see that if we set $F = \mathrm{d}^p_{n+r}\tau^\xi_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$, then the right hand side of (13) is nonzero. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Before completing the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need a characterization of θ.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose (p, n, m) is in stable range. Let W_0 be a Harish-Chandra module of $\mathrm{O}(n, m)$ which has the infinitesimal character and $K_{n,m}$-types as θ. If $n, m > 2p$, then we further assume that W_0 respects the correspondence of infinitesimal characters in Lemma 3.1(i) for the pairs $\mathfrak{so}(n+1) \times \mathfrak{so}(m-1)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(n-1) \times \mathfrak{so}(m+1)$. Then W_0 is isomorphic to θ.*

Proof. If $m = n$, then $\theta = \theta^{n,n}_p$ is - up to a determinantal character - a spherical representation by (6). Hence it is uniquely determined by its infinitesimal character. This proves that $\theta = W_0$.

We suppose that $m > n \geq 2p$. We consider the restriction of W_0 to $(\mathfrak{so}(n,1), K_{n,1}) \times \mathrm{O}(m-1)$:

$$W_0 = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(\mathrm{O}(m-1))} W_0(\mu) \boxtimes \tau^\mu_{\mathrm{O}(m-1)}.$$

We claim $W_0(\mu)$ and $\theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$ are isomorphic $(\mathfrak{so}(n,1), K_{n,1})$-modules. Indeed by our hypothesis, $W_0(\mu)$ has the same $K_{n,1}$-types as $\theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$. If $n = 2p$, then $\theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$ is an irreducible discrete series representation. Hence $W_0(\mu) \simeq \theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$ because irreducible discrete series representations are uniquely determined by its $K_{n,1}$-types. If $n > 2p$, then $\theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$ is an irreducible $(\mathfrak{so}(n,1), \mathrm{SO}(n))$-module. If we set $r = 1$, then $2p < n+1 \leq m-1$ and Lemma 3.1(i) applies. Hence $W_0(\mu)$ has the same infinitesimal character as $\theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$. It is well known that irreducible $(\mathfrak{so}(n,1), \mathrm{SO}(n))$-modules are characterized by its infinitesimal characters and $\mathrm{SO}(n)$-types. This implies that $\theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$ and W_0 are isomorphic $(\mathfrak{so}(n,1), \mathrm{SO}(n))$-modules. They extend to the same $K_{n,1}$-module because they have the same $K_{n,1}$-types. This proves our claim.

Let $v \in W_0(\mu)$ and $X \in \mathfrak{so}(n,1)$. Then we have an $(\mathfrak{so}(n,1), K_{n,1})$-module isomorphism $L : W_0(\mu) \to \theta^{n,1}_p(\mu)$ which is unique up to scalars. Hence $Xv = L^{-1}(X(Lv))$. This shows that Xv is uniquely determined. Since $\mathfrak{so}(n,1)$ and $\mathfrak{k}_{n,m}$ generates $\mathfrak{so}(n,m)$, this proves that there is at most one $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), K_{n,1})$-module structure on W_0. It implies that both W_0 and $\theta^{n,m}_p$ have the same annihilator ideal I. Hence $W_0 \simeq \theta^{n,m}_p \simeq U(\mathfrak{g})/I$ as an $\mathfrak{so}(n,m)$-module. Since W_0 and $\theta^{n,m}_p$ have the same $K_{n,m}$-types, the two modules are isomorphic $(\mathfrak{so}(n,m), K_{n,m})$-modules. This proves the case when $m > n$.

Finally suppose $m < n$. Then we interchange the role of m and n and proceed as before. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Remark. If $m \geq n = 2p$, then the above lemma could be deduced from [T] where Trapa computes the characteristic cycles and annihilator ideal of θ. It is very likely that his method could be extended to give a proof the lemma but without the assumption on the correspondences of infinitesimal characters.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We have proved (i) in the paragraph after (9). Next we prove (ii). The condition $r' \geq 2p$ implies that $\theta(\mu)$ has regular infinitesimal character. We set $W_0 = \Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\mathcal{F}_{n,r,r'}\theta^{n,m}_p)$. By Lemma 3.3, $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}(\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)) = \mathrm{d}^p_{n+r}\tau^{\xi(\mu)}_{\mathrm{O}(n+r)}$. Putting this back into (9) and comparing it with (6), we conclude that W_0 has the $K_{n+r,r'}$-types as $\theta^{n+r,r'}_p$. By the naturality of the Zuckerman functor, the annihilator ideal of a $U(\mathfrak{so}_{2m+2m'+1}(\mathbb{C}))$-module V will also annihilate $\Gamma^i(V)$. Let $I^{n,m}_p$ denote the annihilator ideal of $\theta^{n,m}_p$. Then $I^{n,m}_p$ annihilates W_0. In particular the correspondence of infinitesimal characters in Lemma 3.1(i) holds for W_0. By Lemma 3.4, $W_0 = \theta^{n+r,r'}_p$. This proves (ii).

Next we prove (iii). In the proof of (ii), we have shown that $I^{n,m}_p$ annihilates $W_0 = \theta^{n+r,r'}_p$, ie. $I^{n,m}_p \subseteq I^{n+r,r'}_p$. Similarly if we interchange the role of n and m, then we get $\Gamma^{pr}_{\mathrm{O}(m)}(\theta^{n+r,r'}_p) = \theta^{n,m}_p$ which implies $I^{n,m}_p \supseteq I^{n+r,r'}_p$. This proves the first assertion of (iii). The last assertion follows immediately from [T] which states that the annihilator ideal of $\theta^{2p,m+n-2p}_p$ is the maximal primitive ideal with infinitesimal character $\rho_{n+m} - p\mathbf{1}_{\frac{n+m}{2}}$.

We have already established (1) immediately after Lemma 3.1. We will prove (2). By (iii), it suffices to check this for $\theta^{q,q}_p$ where $q = \frac{1}{2}(m+n)$. We recall that $m+n$ is even. Indeed by [Z], $\theta^{q,q}_p$ embeds into a degenerate principal series representation of $\mathrm{O}(q,q)$. This degenerate principal series representation respects the correspondence in (2). We refer the details to Eq. (23) and (37) in [Lo]. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.2. In Theorem 1.2, we set $r' = m - r$, $\tau = \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}$ and $\theta^{n,m}_p(\tau) = \theta^{n,m}_p(\mu)$. Applying $\Gamma^{pt}_{\mathrm{O}(n+t)}$ to (7), Theorem 1.1 gives

$$\theta^{n+t,m-t}_p = \Gamma^{pt}_{\mathrm{O}(n+t)}(\theta^{n,m}_p) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(\mathrm{O}(r'))} \Gamma^{pt}_{\mathrm{O}(n+t)}(\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)) \boxtimes \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(r')}.$$

The theorem follows by comparing it with (7) for $\theta^{n+t,m-t}_p$. ☐

3.5. Outside of stable range.

Let $m = r + r'$. We will discuss the situation when (p,n,m) is outside of the stable range. We will multiply $\tilde{\theta}^{n,m}_p$ and $\tilde{\theta}^{n,r}_p$ by suitable genuine characters to get Harish-Chandra modules $\theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ of $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$ and $\mathrm{O}(n,r)$ respectively. We will also refer $\theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ as the local theta lifts.

First we look at $\theta^{n,m}_p$. By symmetry, we assume that $n \leq m$. Outside the stable range, $\theta^{n,m}_p$ is nonzero if and only if

(I) $p \leq n \leq 2p-1$ and $m = n+2$ or
(II) $n = m \leq 2p$.

First we consider (I). Let d_n denote the one dimensional character of $\mathrm{O}(n,n+2)$ which is $\det_{\mathrm{O}(n)}$ on $\mathrm{O}(n)$ and trivial on $\mathrm{O}(n+2)$. Then by Lemma 3.5.1 in [Lo], $\mathrm{d}_n\theta^{n,n+2}_p$ has the same $K_{n,n+2}$-types as those of $\theta^{n,n+2}_{n-p}$ in the stable range. By Proposition 6.3.1 in [Lo], the correspondence of the infinitesimal characters between $\mathfrak{so}(n,1)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(m-1) = \mathfrak{so}(n+1)$ is given by the identity map. Hence Lemma 3.4 gives $\mathrm{d}_n\theta^{n,n+2}_p =$

$\theta^{n,n+2}_{n-p}$, and we are back to the stable range. Equation (7) is valid for $\theta^{n,m}_p$ so we also have $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu) = \theta^{n,r}_{n-p}(\mu)$ if $m = n+2 = r+r'$.

For (II), $\theta^{n,n}_p$ is the dual representation of $\theta^{n,n}_{n-1-p}$ in the stable range [Z]. Since all the $K_{n,r}$-types are self dual and -1 belongs to the Weyl group, Lemma 3.1(i) holds for $\theta^{n,n}_p$. By Lemma 3.4, $\theta^{n,n}_p = \theta^{n,n}_{n-1-p}$, and we are back to the stable range.

For all the cases considered so far, we could reduce the computation to the stable range. We will leave it to the readers to formulate the corresponding statements for Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Unfortunately in Case (II), (7) is no longer valid. It is only true if we replace $\theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ by the maximal Howe quotients $\Theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\Theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ respectively. We refer to [Lo] for the definition of maximal Howe quotients. We note that $\theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ are the unique irreducible quotients of $\Theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\Theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ respectively. This complicates the investigation of the transfers of $K_{n,r}$-types for $\theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$. One could manage by a careful analysis of the submodules and the K-types of $\Theta^{n,m}_p$ and $\Theta^{n,r}_p(\mu)$ as given in [Lo]. However it is tedious so we will omit this case.

4. Cohomologically induced modules

The objective of this section is to define $A(\lambda)$ and $\overline{A}(\lambda)$ in Theorem 1.4.

From now on, we assume that $2p \leq n \leq m$, $2p < m$ and $m = r+r'$. We use a subscript 0 to denote a real Lie algebra. Those without are complex Lie algebras. Let $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{so}(n+r, \mathbb{C})$. In Section 1.3, we have chosen a compact Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}_0$ of $\mathfrak{so}(n) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(r)$ in $\mathfrak{so}(n,r)$. Let $t = \dim \mathfrak{t} = [\frac{n}{2}] + [\frac{r}{2}]$. We choose a positive root system $\Phi^+(\mathfrak{t}_0)$ with respect to $\mathfrak{t}_0$ such that the positive roots $\varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$ belongs to $\mathfrak{so}(n)$, and $\varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j$ for $[\frac{n}{2}] + 1 \leq i < j \leq [\frac{n}{2}] + [\frac{r}{2}]$ belongs to $\mathfrak{so}(r)$.

Let $\lambda_0 = (\mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{0}_{t-p})$ and $\lambda_0' = (p, p-1, \ldots, 1, \mathbf{0}_{t-p}) \in \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_0^*$. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$ and $\mathfrak{q}' = \mathfrak{l}' \oplus \mathfrak{n}'$ be the θ-stable parabolic subalgebras in $\mathfrak{g}_1$ defined by λ_0 and λ_0' respectively. We have $\mathfrak{l}_0 = \mathfrak{u}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(n-2p, m)$ and $\mathfrak{l}_0' = \mathfrak{u}(1)^p \oplus \mathfrak{so}(n-2p, m)$. Let

$$L = \mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{O}(n-2p, r) \text{ and } L' = \mathrm{U}(1)^p \times \mathrm{O}(n-2p, r)$$

be the subgroups in $\mathrm{O}(n,r)$ whose Lie algebras are $\mathfrak{l}_0$ and $\mathfrak{l}_0'$ respectively. We note that $\mathfrak{q}'$ and L' is the same as the ones in Section 1.3.

Under the adjoint action of L, the radical $\mathfrak{n}$ of $\mathfrak{q}$ decomposes as

$$\mathfrak{n} = \wedge^2(\mathbb{C}^p) \oplus (\mathbb{C}^p \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n-2p+r})$$

where $\mathbb{C}^p$ is the standard representation of $\mathrm{U}(p)$ and $\mathbb{C}^{n-2p+r}$ the standard representation of $\mathrm{O}(n-2p, r)$. Hence

$$\wedge^{\mathrm{top}}\mathfrak{n} \cong \det{}^{n+r-p-1}_{\mathrm{U}(p)} \otimes \det{}^{p}_{\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)}.$$

From now on, we suppose $2p \leq n \leq m$ and $0 \leq r \leq m$. Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{m-r})$ be a highest weight of $\mathrm{O}(m-r)$ such that $\mu_i = 0$ for $i > p$. Define $Z = Z(\lambda)$ to be an irreducible finite dimensional $\mathrm{U}(p)$-module of highest weight

$$\lambda = \lambda_\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_p) + \frac{m-n-2r}{2}\mathbf{1}_p. \tag{14}$$

We let $\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)$ acts on it by $\det^p_{\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)}$. We continue to denote its highest $\mathfrak{t}$-weight by λ. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{q}}$ denote the parabolic subalgebra that is opposite to $\mathfrak{q}$. We put $Z^\sharp = Z \otimes \wedge^{\mathrm{top}}\mathfrak{n}$ and

$$\mathrm{ind}^{\mathfrak{g}_1}_{\overline{\mathfrak{q}}} Z = U(\mathfrak{g}_1) \otimes_{\overline{\mathfrak{q}}} Z.$$

We will write $\mathrm{ind}Z$ instead if there is no fear of confusion. If Z has infinitesimal character λ_Z, then $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$ has infinitesimal character $\lambda_Z + \rho(\mathfrak{n})$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}_i(Z) = \Pi_i(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$$

where $\Pi_i = (\Pi^{\mathfrak{g},K^0}_{\mathfrak{g},L\cap K^0})_i$ is the i-th derived functor of the Bernstein functor. It has infinitesimal character $\lambda + \rho(\mathfrak{g})$.

We set $s_0 = \dim(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}) = p(n-2p) + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}$. Note that s_0 is independent of r. Let $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}$ be the s_0-th derived functor of the Zuckerman functor of taking $K^0_{n,r}$-finite vectors. We have a $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), K^0_{n,r})$-module $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$.

We will extend $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$ to the disconnected components of $K_{n,r}$. First, since $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$ is already $\mathrm{O}(r)$-finite, the functor $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}$ is the s_0-th derived functor of the Zuckerman functor of taking $\mathrm{SO}(p)$-finite vectors. Using the definition and the treatment of $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}$ in Chapter 6 in [Wa1], $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$ can be computed by considering $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$ as an $(\mathfrak{so}(n), \mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{SO}(n-2p))$-module. Furthermore since $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$ is an $\mathrm{O}(r)$-module, and the action of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ commutes with the action of $\mathrm{O}(r)$, $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$ is naturally an $\mathrm{O}(r)$-module.

Suppose $n = 2p$. We define $A(\lambda) = \Gamma^{s_0}_{K_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp) = \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathrm{O}(n)}_{\mathrm{SO}(n)}\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$ which is an $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r})$-module.

Suppose $n > 2p$. Then $\Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}$ is computed by taking an injective resolution of $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$. This resolution could be chosen to be $\mathrm{O}(n-2p) \times \mathrm{O}(r)$-finite. Hence the functors $\Gamma_{K^0_{n,r}}$ and $\Gamma_{K_{n,r}}$ have the same effect on this resolution. We define

$$A(\lambda) = \Gamma^{s_0}_{K_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp) = \Gamma^{s_0}_{K^0_{n,r}}(\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp)$$

and it is an $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r})$-module.

The next lemma connects $A(\lambda)$ with the $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K^0_{n,r})$-module $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_{s_0}(\mathbb{C}_\lambda)$ defined in Section 1.3.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\lambda = \lambda_\mu = \mu + \frac{m-n-2r}{2}\mathbf{1}_p$, Z and $A(\lambda)$ as above.*

(i) The module $A(\lambda)$ is $\mathrm{O}(n)$-admissible. An $\mathrm{O}(n)$-type of $A(\lambda)$ has highest weight

$$\mathrm{d}^p_n\left(\mu_1 + \kappa_1 + \frac{m-n}{2}, \ldots, \mu_p + \kappa_p + \frac{m-n}{2}, \mathbf{0}_{n-p}\right)$$

where κ_i are non-negative integers.

(ii) The module $A(\lambda)$ contains the $K_{n,r}$-type $\tau_{\min} = \mathrm{d}^p_n\tau^{\mu+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(m)}$ with multiplicity one. It is the minimal $K_{n,r}$-type[1]. It is also the image of the bottom layer map

---

[1] See page 642 in [KV] for the definition of minimal K-types for disconnected K.

(iii) As an $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), K^0_{n,r})$*-module, we have*

$$A(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{s_0}(Z) = A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda) & \text{if } n > 2p \\ \operatorname{Ind}^{\mathrm{O}(n)}_{\mathrm{SO}(n)} A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda) & \text{if } n = 2p. \end{cases}$$

We postpone the proof of the above lemma to after Lemma 5.3. Alternatively one could also verify this lemma directly using the Blattner's formula (see Thm 5.64 in [KV]). The fact that $A(\lambda)$ is admissible with respect to $\mathrm{SO}(n)$ also follows from a very general criterion in [Ko].

Definition. By Part (ii) of the above lemma, we set $\overline{A}(\lambda)$ to be the irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r})$-subquotient of $A(\lambda)$ generated by the minimal $K_{n,r}$-type $\tau_{\min}$.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.4

This section contains the proofs of Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 1.4. The initial argument leading to Lemma 5.4 follows Section 4 in [LS] so we will omit details and refer the reader to that paper. Unfortunately we cannot totally dispense with it because we will need them later in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

We set $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{so}(n+r,\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(n+m,\mathbb{C})$. We recall the theta stable parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. We define $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{so}(n,r) = \mathfrak{l}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{n}_1$. We have a decomposition $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{n}_1 + \mathfrak{n}_2$ such that $\mathfrak{n}_2 = \mathbb{C}^p \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m-r}$ is a tensor product of standard representations of $\mathrm{U}(p)$ and $\mathrm{O}(m-r)$, while the group $\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)$ acts trivially on it. We extend $\mathfrak{n}_2$ to a representation of $\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(m-r)$. It is well known that (see [GoW] and [H3])

$$\operatorname{Sym}^N \mathfrak{n}_2 = \sum_{\mu} \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(p)} \otimes \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(m-r)} \tag{15}$$

where the sum is taken over all partitions μ of N of length not longer than $\min(p, m-r)$. We further restrict the summand $\tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(m-r)}$ to $\mathrm{O}(m-r)$.

With reference to (14), let $\lambda = -\frac{n+m}{2}\mathbf{1}_p$, $Z = \det_{\mathrm{U}(p)}^{-\frac{n+m}{2}} \otimes \det^p_{\mathrm{O}(n-2p,m)}$ and

$$Z^\sharp = \det{}_{\mathrm{U}(p)}^{\frac{n+m}{2}-p-1} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(n-2p,m)}.$$

Let $\mathrm{symm} : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{g}) \to U(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the symmetrization map (see §0.4.2 in [Wa1]). By the Poincare-Birkhoff-Witt theorem,

$$\mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp = U(\mathfrak{n}_1) \otimes \mathrm{symm}(\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{n}_2)) \otimes Z^\sharp \tag{16}$$

as $L_1 \times \mathrm{O}(m-r)$-modules. Let $S_N(\mathfrak{n}_2) = \sum_{i=0}^N \mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{n}_2)$. We define $\mathcal{F}_N$ to be the $\mathfrak{so}(n,r)$-submodule of $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$ generated by $1 \otimes \mathrm{symm}(S_N(\mathfrak{n}_2)) \otimes Z^\sharp$. Hence $\{\mathcal{F}_N : N = 0,1,2,\ldots\}$ forms an exhaustive increasing filtration of $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), \mathrm{U}(p) \times K_{n-2p,r}) \times \mathrm{O}(m-r)$-submodules of $\mathrm{ind}Z^\sharp$. We set

$$V_r(\mu) = \mathrm{ind}^{\mathfrak{g}_1}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}(Z(\mu)^\sharp) = \mathrm{ind}^{\mathfrak{g}_1}_{\mathfrak{q}_1}(\tau_{\mathrm{U}(p)}^{\mu + (\frac{m+n}{2} - 2p)\mathbf{1}_p} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(n-2p,r)}).$$

Let $\mathcal{B}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}(N)$) denote the partitions (resp. partitions of N) of length not more than $\min(p, m-r)$. We will now state a special case of a known fact which is used in proof of the Blattner's formula in [KV].

Lemma 5.1. *For every positive integer N, we have an isomorphism of $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), \mathrm{U}(p)\times K_{n-2p,r})\times \mathrm{O}(m-r)$-modules*

$$\mathcal{F}_N/\mathcal{F}_{N-1} = \bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{B}(N)} V_r(\mu)\otimes (\tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(m-r)}|_{\mathrm{O}(m-r)}). \qquad \square$$

Case 1. We first consider the case $r=0$, $\mathfrak{g}_1=\mathfrak{so}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $V_r(\mu)=V_0(\mu)$. We claim that for $\mu\in\mathcal{B}$, $V_0(\mu)$ is an irreducible generalize Verma module of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$. Indeed it satisfies an irreducibility criterion in Theorem 9.12 in [Hu].

The infinitesimal character of $V_0(\mu)$ is the same as the infinitesimal of $\tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{\mu+(\frac{m-n}{2})\mathbf{1}_p}$. Hence these infinitesimal characters are pairwise different for different partitions μ. It follows that the filtration $\mathcal{F}_N$ splits and we have

$$\mathrm{ind}Z^{\sharp} = \bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{B}} V_0(\mu)\otimes(\tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(m)}|_{\mathrm{O}(m)}) \tag{17}$$

where the sum is taken over all partitions μ of length no more than $\min(p,m)$. We recall that the Zuckerman functor Γ^j is computed in the category of $(\mathfrak{so}(n),\mathrm{U}(p)\times\mathrm{O}(n-2p))$-modules. Applying Γ^j to the above equation gives

$$\Gamma^j(\mathrm{ind}Z^{\sharp}) = \bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{B}} \Gamma^j(V_0(\mu))\otimes(\tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(m)}|_{\mathrm{O}(m)}).$$

Since $s_0=\dim(\mathfrak{n}_1)$ in this case, by the Borel-Weil-Bott-Kostant theorem, $\Gamma^j(V_0(\mu))=0$ if $j\neq s_0$ and $\Gamma^{s_0}(V_0(\mu))=\mathrm{d}^p_n\tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{\mu+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p}$. In particular, if $\lambda=-\frac{n+m}{2}\mathbf{1}_p$, then

$$A(\lambda)=\bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathcal{B}} \mathrm{d}^p_n\tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{\mu+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p}\otimes(\tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{U}(m)}|_{\mathrm{O}(m)}) \tag{18}$$

and it has minimal $K_{n,r}$-type $\tau_{\min}=\mathrm{d}^p_n\tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p}\otimes\mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(m)}$ which occurs with multiplicity one.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose W_1,W_2,W_3 are $(\mathfrak{so}(n),\mathrm{U}(p)\times\mathrm{O}(n-2p))$-subquotients of* $\mathrm{ind}Z^{\sharp}$ *and suppose they satisfy an exact sequence*

$$0\to W_1\to W_2\to W_3\to 0.$$

(i) Each W_k is a direct summand of (17) *and $W_k=\oplus_{\mu'}V_0(\mu')$ is a direct sum taken over certain partitions μ' of length no more than* $\min(p,m)$*.*

(ii) If $j\neq s_0$, then $\Gamma^jW_k=0$. Moreover we have an exact sequence

$$0\to\Gamma^{s_0}W_1\to\Gamma^{s_0}W_2\to\Gamma^{s_0}W_3\to 0.$$

(iii) Each $\Gamma^{s_0}W_j$ is $\mathrm{O}(n)$*-admissible.*

Proof. Part (i) follows from (17). Part (ii) follows from (i) and the Borel-Weil-Bott-Kostant theorem alluded above. By (ii) each $\Gamma^{s_0}W_j$ is an $\mathrm{O}(n)$-subquotient of $A(\lambda)$ in (18) which is $\mathrm{O}(n)$-admissible. $\square$

Case 2. Now we return to the general r for $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{so}(n,r)$. Let $V_r(\mu)$ be a subquotient in Lemma 5.1. By Lemma 5.2(i), $V_r(\mu) = \oplus_{\mu'} V_0(\mu')$. The next lemma proof follows a similar argument as Lemma 4.5 in [LS].

Lemma 5.3. *If $V_0(\mu') \subseteq V_r(\mu)$, then $\mu' = \mu + \kappa$ where κ is an p-tuple of non-negative integers. Furthermore $V_r(\mu)$ contains $V_0(\mu)$ with multiplicity one and $\mathrm{O}(r)$ acts trivially on it.* ☐

Proof of Lemma 4.1. By Lemma 5.3 above, $V_r(\mu) = \oplus_\kappa V(\mu+\kappa)$ where the sum κ is taken over a set of p-tuples of non-negative integers. Let $\lambda = -\frac{n+m}{2}\mathbf{1}_p$ and $\lambda_\mu = \mu + (\frac{m-n-2r}{2})\mathbf{1}_p$. Applying Γ^{s_0} to the direct sum gives

$$A(\lambda_\mu) = \Gamma^{s_0}(V_r(\mu)) = \oplus_\kappa \Gamma^{s_0} V(\mu+\kappa) = \oplus_\kappa \mathrm{d}^p_n \tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{\mu+\kappa+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p} \tag{19}$$

as an $\mathrm{O}(n)$-submodule of $A(\lambda)$. Lemma 4.1(i) follows because $A(\lambda)$ is $\mathrm{O}(n)$-admissible.

By the second assertion of Lemma 5.3, $V_r(\mu)$ contains a unique copy of $V_0(\mu)$ with trivial $\mathrm{O}(r)$ actions. Hence $A(\lambda_\mu)$ contains $\mathrm{d}^p_n \tau_{\mathrm{O}(n)}^{\mu+\frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_p} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(r)}$ with multiplicity one. It is clear that this is the minimal $K_{n,r}$-type of $A(\lambda_\mu)$. This proves of Lemma 4.1(ii).

The equality $\mathcal{L}_{s_0}(Z) = A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$ in (ii) follows from a standard spectral sequence argument. Given a $(\mathfrak{g}, K^0)$-module W, we set W^{h} to be the subspace of K^0-finite vectors in the conjugate linear dual vector space of W. By Eq. (6.25) in [KV], $\mathcal{L}_{s_0}(Z)^{\mathrm{h}} = \Gamma^{s_0}((\mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp)^{\mathrm{h}})$. By Theorem 6.3.5 in [Wa1], there is a non-degenerate sesquilinear pairing between $\Gamma^{s_0}((\mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp)^{\mathrm{h}})$ and $\Gamma^{s_0}(\mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp)$. Since $\Gamma^{s_0}(\mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp)$ is $\mathrm{SO}(n)$-admissible by (i), this proves Lemma 4.1(iii). The proof of Lemma 4.1 is now complete. ☐

Applying Lemma 5.2 to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_N$ gives the next lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *In the category of $(\mathfrak{g}_1, K_{n,r}) \times \mathrm{O}(m-r)$-modules, $\Gamma^{s_0}(\mathcal{F}_N)$ is an exhaustive increasing filtration of $A(\lambda)$ and*

$$\Gamma^{s_0}(\mathcal{F}_N)/\Gamma^{s_0}(\mathcal{F}_{N-1}) = \Gamma^{s_0}(\mathcal{F}_N/\mathcal{F}_{N-1}) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{B}(N)} A(\lambda_\mu) \otimes (\tau^\mu_{\mathrm{U}(m-r)}|_{\mathrm{O}(m-r)}). \quad ☐$$

Proof of Theorem 1.4(i). Let c be an integer and let $\lambda = -c\mathbf{1}_p$. Choose integers $2p \leq n \leq m$ such that $n + m = 2c$. We will denote Harish-Chandra module $\overline{A}(\lambda)$ of the group $\mathrm{O}(n,m)$ by $\overline{A}_{n,m}(\lambda)$.

First we consider the special case when the group is $\mathrm{O}(2p, 2c-2p)$, $p \leq c$ and $s_0 = p(p-1)/2$. In [Kn], Knapp constructs an exact sequence of $\mathfrak{so}(2c,\mathbb{C})$-modules

$$0 \to Q' \to \mathrm{ind}_{\overline{\mathfrak{q}}}^{\mathfrak{so}(2c,\mathbb{C})} Z^\sharp \to Q \to 0 \tag{20}$$

where $\mathfrak{q} = (\mathfrak{u}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{so}(2c-2p)) \oplus \mathfrak{n}$. By Lemma 5.2(i) $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathfrak{so}(2c,\mathbb{C})} Z^\sharp$, Q and Q' are direct sums of $V_0(\mu)$'s. Furthermore Q contains the bottom layer $V_0(\mu = 0)$. Let $s = p(p-1)/2$. Lemma 5.2(ii) gives

$$0 \to \Gamma^s_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} Q' \to \Gamma^s_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} \mathrm{ind}_{\overline{\mathfrak{q}}}^{\mathfrak{so}(2c,\mathbb{C})} Z^\sharp \to \Gamma^s_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} Q \to 0. \tag{21}$$

Since Q contains $V_0(0)$, $\Gamma^s_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} Q$ contains the minimal $K_{2p,2c-2p}$-type of $A_{2p,2c-2p}(\lambda) = \Gamma^s_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} \mathrm{ind}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathfrak{so}(2c,\mathbb{C})} Z^\sharp$. Hence $\overline{A}_{2p,2c-2p}(\lambda)$ is a subquotient of $\Gamma^s_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} Q$.

Knapp shows that $\pi_0 := \Gamma^s_{K^0_{2p,2c-2p}} Q$ is a unitarizable $(\mathfrak{so}(2p,2c-2p), K^0_{2p,2c-2p})$-quotient of $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda) = \Gamma^s_{K^0_{2p,2c-2p}} \mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp$ and π_0 contains the minimal $K^0_{2p,2c-2p}$-type of $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda)$. Trapa proves that π_0 is an irreducible module [T]. By definition, $\overline{A}_{2p,2c-2p}(\lambda) = \Gamma^s Q = \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathrm{O}(2p)}_{\mathrm{SO}(2p)} \pi_0$. Using the description of $K^0_{2p,2c-2p}$-types of π_0 in [Kn], one checks that $\overline{A}_{2p,2c-2p}(\lambda)$ has the same $K_{2p,2c-2p}$-types as $\theta^{2p,2c-2p}_p$. Hence $\overline{A}_{2p,2c-2p}(\lambda) = \theta^{2p,2c-2p}_p$ by Lemma 3.4. Alternatively, this also follows from [PT] where Paul and Trapa prove that π_0 is a submodule of $\theta^{2p,2c-2p}_p$.

Now turn to the general case, ie. $2p < n \leq c$, $m = 2c-n$ and $s_0 = p(n-2p) + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}$. Repeating the argument with n instead of $2p$ in (21) gives

$$0 \to \Gamma^{s_0}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} Q' \to \Gamma^{s_0}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} \mathrm{ind}^{\mathfrak{so}(2c,\mathbb{C})}_{\bar{\mathfrak{q}}} Z^\sharp \to \Gamma^{s_0}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} Q \to 0.$$

By Proposition 6.2.17 in [Vo1], we have a spectral sequence $\Gamma^a_{\mathrm{O}(n)/\mathrm{O}(2p)} \Gamma^b_{\mathrm{O}(2p)} \Rightarrow \Gamma^{a+b}_{\mathrm{O}(n)}$. If we set $b = p(p-1)/2$ and $a = s_0 - b = p(n-2p)$, then we get $\Gamma^{s_0}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} Q = \Gamma^{p(n-2p)}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} \theta^{2p,2c-2p}_p = \theta^{n,m}_p$. The last equality follows from Theorem 1.1(ii). Hence $\theta^{n,m}_p$ is an irreducible quotient of $\Gamma^{s_0} \mathrm{ind} Z^\sharp$ containing the minimal $K_{n,m}$-type, ie. $\overline{A}_{n,m}(\lambda) = \theta^{n,m}_p$. This proves Theorem 1.4(i). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4(ii). Since θ is an irreducible subquotient of $A(\lambda)$, it follows that $\theta(\mu) \otimes \tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(m-r)}$ is an irreducible subquotient of $A(\lambda)$, considered as $(\mathfrak{so}(n,r), K_{n,r}) \times \mathrm{O}(m-r)$-module. This implies that $\theta(\mu)$ is an irreducible subquotient of $A(\lambda_{\mu'}) = \Gamma^{s_0}(V_r(\mu'))$ for some μ' such that $\tau^{\mu'}_{\mathrm{U}(m-r)}$ contains $\tau^{\mu}_{\mathrm{O}(m-r)}$. We recall that $\theta^{n,m}_p$ contains the $K_{n,r}$-type $W = \mathrm{d}^p_n \tau^{\mu + \frac{m-n}{2}\mathbf{1}_m}_{\mathrm{O}(n)} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\mathrm{O}(r)} = \Gamma^{s_0}(V_0(\mu))$. Hence $A(\lambda_{\mu'})$ contains W.

We claim that $\mu = \mu'$. Indeed we embed the torus $\mathfrak{t}$ of $\mathrm{O}(m-r)$ in the torus of $\mathrm{U}(m-r)$ so that the restriction of positive $\mathrm{U}(m-r)$ roots to $\mathrm{O}(m-r)$ remains positive. By Lemma 5.3 and (19), $\mu = \mu' + \kappa = \mu + (\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_p) \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ where $\kappa_i \geq 0$. On the other hand any weight of $\tau^{\mu'}_{\mathrm{U}(m-r)}$ is of the form $\mu' - (\sum_\alpha \alpha)$ where the sum $\sum_\alpha$ is taken over positive roots of $\mathrm{U}(m-r)$ with multiplicities. Hence $\mu = \mu' + \kappa = \mu' - (\sum_\alpha \alpha)$ on $\mathfrak{t}$. This forces $\kappa_1 = \ldots = \kappa_p = 0$ and $\mu = \mu'$. This proves our claim.

From our claim $\theta(\mu)$ is the irreducible subquotient of $\theta(\mu)$ generated by $K_{n,r}$-type W. Since W is the unique minimal $K_{n,r}$-type of $A(\lambda_\mu)$, $\theta(\mu) = \overline{A}(\lambda_\mu)$. This proves Theorem 1.4(ii). $\square$

References

[EHW] T. Enright, R. Howe and N. Wallach, *A classification of unitary highest weight modules.* Representation theory of reductive groups (Park City, Utah, 1982), 97–143, Progr. Math., 40, Birkhuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983.

[GoW] Roe Goodman and Nolan R. Wallach, *Representations and Invariants of the Classical Groups* Cambridge U. Press, 1998; third corrected printing, 2003.

[GW] B.H. Gross and N.R. Wallach, *On quaternionic discrete series representations, and their continuations.* J. Reine Angew. Math. 481 (1996), 73-123

[H1] R. Howe, *Remarks on classical invariant theory.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **313** (1989), no. 2, 539–570.

[H2] R. Howe *Transcending classical invariant theory.* J. AMS **2** no. 3 (1989).

[H3] Roger Howe *Perspectives on invariant theory: Schur duality, multiplicity-free actions and beyond.* The Schur lectures (1992) (Tel Aviv), 1–182, Israel Math. Conf. Proc., 8, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1995.

[HZ] C.-B. Zhu and J.-S. Huang, *On certain small representations of indefinite orthogonal groups.* Representation theory **1**, (1997), 190-206.

[Hu] J. E. Humphreys, *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in the BGG category O.* AMS (2008), ISBN: 0821846787.

[KaV] M. Kashiwara and M. Vergne, *On the Segal-Shale-Weil representations and harmonic polynomials.* Invent. Math. **44** (1978), no. 1, 1-47.

[Kn] A. Knapp, *Nilpotent orbits and some unitary representations of indefinite orthogonal groups.* J. Funct. Anal. 209 (2004), 36-100.

[KV] A. Knapp and D. Vogan, *Cohomological induction and unitary representations*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey (1995).

[Ko] T. Kobayashi, *Discrete decomposability of the restriction of $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ with respect to reductive subgroups. III. Restriction of Harish-Chandra modules and associated varieties.* Invent. Math. 131 (1998), no. 2, 229-256.

[KØ] T. Kobayashi and B. Ørsted, *Analysis of the minimal representation of* $\mathrm{O}(p,q)$ *I, II, III.* Adv. Math. 180, No 2 (2003) 486-595.

[Li] J.-S. Li, *Singular unitary representations of classical groups*, Invent. Math. **97** (1990), 237-255.

[LZ] S. T. Lee and C.-B. Zhu, *Degenerate principal series and local theta correspondence. II.* Israel J. Math. **100** (1997), 29–59.

[LS] H. Y. Loke and G. Savin, *Some unitary representations of orthogonal groups.*, Journal of Functional Analysis 255 (2008) 184-199.

[Lo] H. Y. Loke, *Howe quotients of unitary characters and unitary lowest weight modules.* Representation Theory. 10 (2006), 21-47.

[Pz] T. Przebinda, *The duality correspondence of infinitesimal characters.* Colloq. Math. 70. (1996), no. 1, 93–102.

[PT] Annegret Paul and Peter Trapa. *Some small unipotent representations of indefinite orthogonal groups and the theta correspondence.* University of Aarhus Publication Series, 48 (2007), 103-125.

[Ta] U-Liang Tang, *The structure of Howe quotients of unitary lowest weight modules.* Preprint.

[T] Peter E. Trapa, *Some small unipotent representations of indefinite orthogonal groups.* Journal of Functional Analysis **213** (2004) 290-320.

[Vo1] D. Vogan, *Representations of real reductive Lie groups*, Birkhauser, Boston-Basel-Stuttgart, (1981).

[VZ] D. A. Vogan and G. J. Zuckerman, *Unitary representations with nonzero cohomology.* Compositio Math. 53 (1984), no. 1, 51-90.

[Wa1] N. R. Wallach *Real reductive groups I.* Academic press, (1988).

[Wa2] N. R. Wallach, *Transfer of unitary representations between real forms.* Representation theory and analysis on homogeneous spaces (New Brunswick, NJ, 1993), 181-216, Contemp. Math., 177, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[WZ] N. R. Wallach and C.-B. Zhu, *Transfer of unitary representations between real forms.* Asian Jour. Math. 8, No. 4, (2004), 861-880.

[Z] C.-B. Zhu, *Invariant distributions of classical groups.* Duke Math. J. **65** (1992), 85-119.

Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543

E-mail address: `matlhy@nus.edu.sg`, `jiajun_ma@nus.edu.sg`, `tang_u_liang@sp.edu.sg`